Remarks

The final Office action dated August 19, 2008 has been received and carefully considered. Claims 1-29, 31-33, 35-37, and 39-42 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 8, 13, 20, 25, 28, 35-37, and 40-42 have been amended. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Entry is proper because Applicant believes that these amendments put the application in condition for allowance, in view of the September 5, 2008, interview.

Interview

Applicant appreciates Examiner Lewis' interview participation on September 5, 2008, and indication that he would enter amendments if possible. Although no agreement was reached, changes to the independent claims along the lines of the present amendments (*e.g.*, to further define the configuration of the body) were discussed. The Examiner agreed that he would attempt to consider such amendments. The current rejections and objections were also discussed.

Objections to the claims

Claims 13 has been amended to include line indentations. Claims 8, 20, and 28 have been amended to read "in said supply conduit" instead of "is said supply conduit." Claims 40-42 have been amended to clarify the distinction between the first and second portions of the adapter electrical leads and the first and second ends of the adapter electrical leads. Applicant therefore submits that the amendments overcome the objections to the claims.

35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejections

The Office action rejected claims 8-12, 20-24, and 28-29, contending that the second disclosed embodiment is allegedly not enabled. As the Office action points out, movable adapter leads 16A and 17A move between position 1, as shown in FIG. 4A, and position 2, as shown in FIG. 4B, "via an operating element, preferably a switch (not shown)." According to page 3 of the Office action, "it is unclear how a 'switch' can simply move electrical leads 16A and 17A from one side of the adapter to the other."

Applicant notes that the language quoted above contains an oversight, which is corrected in the amendment to the specification above. The original specification implies that the switch is not shown, when in fact it is the operating element that is not shown. The original specification also implies that the operating element can be a switch, when in fact the operating element is a component of the switch. The switch enables a user to alter the contact arrangement, and comprises the operating element and the leads 16A-C and 17A-C. The operating element is simply the actuator that alters the contact arrangement; such operating elements/actuators are well known in the art. Regardless of whether the particular actuator disclosed in Ross would be operable in embodiments of the present application, numerous operating elements and switch actuators are well known in the art. See, for example, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Switch.

Because all claimed embodiments are enabled and adequately described, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejections be withdrawn, as discussed during the interview.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections

Claims 1, 7-12, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,204,243 to Ross. Independent claim 1 recites an adapter comprising "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, and wherein said first and second ends [of the adapter electrical leads] are located at the periphery of said hollow space." Ross does not recite an adapter having such features. If, as the Office action alleges, the elements 76g and 76h disclosed in Ross are adapter electrical leads, they do not anticipate this feature of claim 1 because the elements 76g and 76h are located inside the adapter and not at the periphery of a hollow space for accommodation of a coupling spigot.

If, on the other hand, the Examiner instead considers the line terminals 71n, 71g, 71h to be adapter electrical leads within a hollow space 71, Ross still does not anticipate claim 1. Claim 1 further recites that "the adapter is selectively switchable without disassembly by a manual operation to move the adapter leads relative to the supply conduit to match a polarity." The line terminals 71n, 71g, 71h are not movable relative to any supply conduit and thus cannot anticipate these features of claim 1.

Thus, Ross does not disclose, or even suggest, every element of claim 1 or dependent claims 7-12 because the polarity indicating and reversing unit disclosed in Ross does not include

the hollow space or the movable adapter electrical leads as discussed above. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 35 recites an adapter comprising "first and second adapter electrical leads with respective first and second axially offset slide contacts" and "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, [] wherein said first and second axially offset slide contacts are located at the periphery of said hollow space." The polarity indicating and reversing unit disclosed in Ross does not anticipate claim 35 because it does not disclose axially offset slide contacts. Further, and as discussed in connection with claim 1, Ross does not recite an adapter having a hollow space, wherein a portion of the adapter electrical leads (e.g. the axially offset slide contacts) are located at a periphery of the hollow space. For at least these reasons, Ross does not disclose, or even suggest, every element of claim 35, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,626,354 to Banner. Independent claim 1 recites an adapter having first and second adapter electrical leads, "wherein the adapter comprises a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, and wherein said first and second ends [of the adapter electrical leads] are located at the periphery of said hollow space." Banner does not disclose an adapter having a hollow space for accommodation of a coupling spigot. Thus, Banner cannot disclose first and second ends of adapter electrical leads located at the periphery of a hollow space. Even if the Examiner were to take the position that the recesses 10-12 of Banner are hollow spaces for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, Banner would still not anticipate claim 1 because no ends of any adapter electrical leads would be located at the periphery of the alleged hollow space.

Claim 1 further recites "an adapter body having a first body end, a second body end, and a substantially straight longitudinal axis extending between the first and second body ends, wherein the first body end is adapted for attachment to one of the supply conduit and the medical instrument and the second body end is adapted for attachment to the other of the supply conduit and the medical instrument…and…wherein the first adapter electrical lead comprises a first end and the second adapter electrical lead comprises a second end, said first and second ends being axially offset along the longitudinal axis of the adapter body such that the first end is located a first distance from the first body end and the second end is located a second distance from the

first body end, where the first distance is not equal to the second distance." The Office action alleges, at page 5, that Banner's adapter has a body 1' "with a first edge (circular end from which contacts 4, 5, and 6 extend)" such that the "end 11 of the lead 4/11 extends a greater longitudinal distance from the first edge than the end of the lead 5/10." The adapter body shown in Banner's FIG. 3, however, contains a right angle bend and cannot anticipate claim 1 because it does not have a substantially straight longitudinal axis extending from the first body end to the second body end.

The polarity-reversing adapter means disclosed in Banner does not anticipate claim 1 or dependent claims 2-6 at least because it does not disclose a hollow space with adapter electrical leads located at the periphery of the hollow space, nor does it disclose a substantially straight longitudinal axis extending between first and second body ends, where the body ends are adapted for attachment to one of the supply conduit and the medical instrument. Thus, Banner does not disclose, or even suggest, every element of these claims, and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 35 recites an adapter comprising "first and second axially offset slide contacts." The polarity-reversing adapter means disclosed in Banner does not anticipate claim 35 because it does not disclose axially offset slide contacts. Furthermore, like claim 1, claim 35 also recites "a substantially straight longitudinal axis extending between the first and second body ends, wherein the first body end is adapted for attachment to one of the supply conduit and the medical instrument and the second body end is adapted for attachment to the other of the supply conduit and the medical instrument" and "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, and wherein said first and second axially offset slide contacts are located at the periphery of said hollow space." Thus, for at least the same reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1, Banner does not disclose, or even suggest, every element of claim 35, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections

Claims 13, 17, 20-25, 28-29, 35-37, and 39-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Otsuka in view of Ross. The Office action alleges at page 6 that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to "use a Ross adapter to reverse the polarity of a power source wired backwards in order to protect the Otsuka device." This

combination of references, however, does not teach or suggest all of the features of these claims, and thus cannot render these claims obvious.

Independent claim 13 and dependent claims 17, 20-24, and 39 recite an adapter comprising "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, [] wherein said first and second ends [of adapter electrical leads] are located at the periphery of said hollow space." As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Ross does not teach or suggest this feature. Otsuka merely discloses an optical and resin curing apparatus, and thus cannot cure the defects in Ross related to the adapter. For at least this reason, the combination of Otsuka and Ross does not render these claims obvious.

Independent claim 25 and dependent claims 28-29 also recite an adapter comprising "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, [] wherein said first and second ends [of adapter electrical leads] are located at the periphery of said hollow space." Thus, claims 25 and 28-29 are not obvious in view of Otsuka and Ross for at least the same reasons claim 13 is not obvious.

Independent claim 35 and dependent claim 40 recite an adapter comprising "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, [] wherein said first and second axially offset slide contacts are located at the periphery of said hollow space." Claim 35 further recites "first and second adapter electrical leads and respective first and second axially offset slide contacts." As discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 35, Ross does not teach or suggest these features. Otsuka merely discloses an optical and resin curing apparatus, and thus cannot cure the defects in Ross related to the adapter. For at least these reasons, the combination of Otsuka and Ross does not render these claims obvious.

Independent claim 36 and dependent claim 41 also recite an adapter comprising "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, [] wherein said first and second ends [of the adapter electrical leads] are located at the periphery of said hollow space." Claim 36 also recites "first and second adapter electrical leads and respective first and second axially offset slide contacts." Thus, claims 36 and 41 are not obvious in view of Otsuka and Ross for at least the same reasons claim 35 is not obvious.

Likewise, independent claim 37 and dependent claim 42 recite an adapter comprising "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, [] wherein said first and second axially offset slide contacts are located at the periphery of said hollow space." Claim 37 also

recites "first and second adapter electrical leads and respective first and second axially offset slide contacts." Thus, claims 37 and 42 are not obvious in view of Otsuka and Ross for at least the same reasons claim 35 is not obvious.

Neither Otsuka nor Ross disclose or suggest the hollow space of claims 13, 17, 20-25, 28-29, 35-37, and 39-42 or the "axially offset slide contacts" of claims 35-37 and 40-42. Thus, the combination of these references cannot render obvious the claimed embodiments. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 13-19, 25-27, 31-37, and 39-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Otsuka in view of Banner. The Office action alleges at page 6 that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use "a Banner adapter to reverse the polarity of a power source wired backwards in order to protect the Otsuka device." This combination of references, however, does not teach or suggest all of the features of these claims, and thus cannot render these claims obvious.

Independent claim 13 and dependent claims 14-19, 32, and 39 recite an adapter comprising "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, [] wherein said first and second ends [of adapter electrical leads] are located at the periphery of said hollow space." These claims also recite "a substantially straight longitudinal axis extending between the first and second body ends, wherein the first body end is adapted for attachment to one of the supply conduit and the light source and the second body end is adapted for attachment to the other of the supply conduit and the light source." As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Banner does not teach or suggest these features. Otsuka merely discloses an optical and resin curing apparatus, and thus cannot cure the defects in Banner related to the adapter. For at least these reasons, the combination of Otsuka and Banner does not render these claims obvious.

Independent claim 25 and dependent claims 26-27 and 33 also recite an adapter comprising "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, [] wherein said first and second ends [of adapter electrical leads] are located at the periphery of said hollow space" and "a substantially straight longitudinal axis extending between the first and second body ends, wherein the first body end is adapted for attachment to one of the supply conduit and the light source and the second body end is adapted for attachment to the other of the supply conduit and the light source." Thus, claims 25-27 and 33 are not obvious in view of Otsuka and Banner for at least the same reasons claim 13 is not obvious.

Independent claim 35 and dependent claim 40 recite an adapter comprising "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, [] wherein said first and second axially offset slide contacts are located at the periphery of said hollow space" and "a substantially straight longitudinal axis extending between the first and second body ends, wherein the first body end is adapted for attachment to one of the supply conduit and the medical instrument and the second body end is adapted for attachment to the other of the supply conduit and the medical instrument." Claim 35 further recites "first and second adapter electrical leads and respective first and second axially offset slide contacts." As discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 35, Banner does not teach or suggest these features. Otsuka merely discloses an optical and resin curing apparatus, and thus cannot cure the defects in Banner related to the adapter. For at least these reasons, the combination of Otsuka and Banner does not render these claims obvious.

Independent claim 36 and dependent claim 41 also recite an adapter comprising "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, [] wherein said first and second ends [of the adapter electrical leads] are located at the periphery of said hollow space" and "a substantially straight longitudinal axis extending between the first and second body ends, wherein the first body end is adapted for attachment to one of the supply conduit and the light source and the second body end is adapted for attachment to the other of the supply conduit and the light source." Claim 36 also recites "first and second adapter electrical leads and respective first and second axially offset slide contacts." Thus, claims 36 and 41 are not obvious in view of Otsuka and Banner for at least the same reasons claim 35 is not obvious.

Likewise, independent claim 37 and dependent claim 42 recite an adapter comprising "a hollow space for releasable accommodation of a coupling spigot, [] wherein said first and second axially offset slide contacts are located at the periphery of said hollow space" and "a substantially straight longitudinal axis extending between the first and second body ends, wherein the first body end is adapted for attachment to one of the supply hose and the light source and the second body end is adapted for attachment to the other of the supply hose and the light source." Claim 37 also recites "first and second adapter electrical leads and respective first and second axially offset slide contacts." Thus, claims 37 and 42 are not obvious in view of Otsuka and Banner for at least the same reasons claim 35 is not obvious.

Dependent claim 31 depends from claim 1. As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Banner does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1. Otsuka merely

discloses an optical and resin curing apparatus, and thus cannot cure the defects in Banner related to the adapter. For at least these reasons, the combination of Otsuka and Banner does not render claim 31 obvious.

Neither Otsuka nor Banner disclose or suggest the hollow space or the substantially straight longitudinal axis of claims 13-19, 25-27, 31-37, and 39-42 or the "axially offset slide contacts" of claims 35-37 and 40-42. Thus, the combination of these references cannot render obvious the claimed embodiments. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are directed to allowable subject matter and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By /Amy B. Durocher/
Amy B. Durocher
Registration No. 62,065